Hi Sally, David and Gary:

1) The Department of Economics did everything asked of it (or more, in some cases) by the faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee. The new Department Chair (myself) sent that "checked-off-list" to President Barron as it was completed.

2) There were two items dealing with the MOU that the Department could not address on its own:

a) Remove the disputed language on faculty reviews. This was done and the Department fully supports this change.

b) The Ad-Hoc Committee recommended removing the "unanimity rule" if the "Koch Advisory Committee" was going to continue to play a role in department hiring. In a meeting with President Barron, it was clear that he wanted to go beyond this and eliminate the "Advisory Committee" entirely from any role in hiring. This was done in the revised MOU. The "Koch Advisory Committee" now plays no role whatsoever in any department hiring. The revised MOU switches to a "grant application" model which is in effect only for faculty *already hired on department-funded lines by regular department hiring policies*. President Barron and Provost Stokes approved the final language. The Department fully supports this change.

3) Speaking officially only for myself (although my sentiments would surely be shared by the vast majority of other members of our department) I believe that any attempt by anyone (students, faculty, external pressure groups) to tell a member of my department "You may not make a grant application to Foundation X because we don't like Foundation X," is, at a minimum, a gross violation of academic freedom. Such attempts may also raise CBA and State of Florida legal issues, but those are not within my area of expertise.

Hope this helps. If I need to do anything to clarify, please feel free to contact me again,

Mark

From: McRorie, Sally
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 10:33 AM
To: Rasmussen, David W; Isaac, Mark; Tyson, Gary
Subject: comment

Would each of you please send me a brief comment about the Koch issues within your sphere? It's clear from all conversations what the judgment of you and your colleagues is, but we could use a succinct statement from each of you that puts that into a sentence or two.
Thanks,
Sally